

Remarks

Claims 1-21 are pending, and claims 1-21 stand rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, and 17 in this Response. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections set forth by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,603,478 (Kuo) in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,533,174 (Flowers).

Claim 1 recites a method for switching fonts without embedding font switches in the data. According to the method, a character is received to be effectively deleted from a first base font resource. A new font resource is created which includes the received character. The new font resource is linked to the first base font resource to in effect delete the received character from the first base font resource. The new font resource and the first base font resource act as if they are a uniform font resource.

The Applicants submit that neither Kuo or Flowers teaches or suggests the limitation of "linking said new font resource to said first base font resource to in effect delete the received character from said first base font resource" as recited in claim 1.

Kuo discloses a client computer running an application having Asian fonts that is connected to a server. When a specific Asian character is not located within the application running on the client computer, a character request is sent to the server. The server processes the character request, and if the requested Asian character is in a server database, then the server transmits the requested character to the application on the client computer for display. The Applicants submit that nothing in Kuo teaches or suggests that either the client computer or the server is operable to "delete the received character from" a font resource, as recited in claim 1. For example, Kuo does not teach or suggest linking the requested character to a font resource on the client computer to in effect delete the requested character from the font resource on client computer. In addition, Kuo does not teach or suggest linking the requested character to the structured database to in effect delete the requested character from the structured database.

Flowers discloses a font server coupled with a font storage. The font server is also coupled with a workstation (FIG. 2). When a client (e.g., "the workstation") is instructed to

display or print a data file, the client determines if a user has included a font within the data file that exists in the font storage. If the font exists in the font storage, then the client issues a "make font" request of the font server. The font server then retrieves the font indicated in the "make font" request from the font storage and provides the font to the client (Column 5, lines 5-15; Column 6, lines 6-19). The Applicants submit that nothing in Flowers teaches or suggests that the client is operable to generate "make font" requests to the font server to, in effect, delete characters from the font storage. For example, nothing in Flowers suggests that a user can select specific fonts in the data file, issue a "make font" request to the font server regarding the selected font, and instruct the font server to effectively delete the selected font from the font storage.

For at least the reasons provided, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is non-obvious in view of Kuo and Flowers, considered individually or in combination. Similar arguments apply for claim 8 and 15. Dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are non-obvious at least for depending on base claims 1, 8, or 15, respectively.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-21 are non-obvious in view of the cited art, and therefore respectfully request the Examiner allow claims 1-21.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 18, 2009

/Sean J. Varley/

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
Duft, Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)
Customer Number: 50441